UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,890	06/05/2007	Frank Duvinage	095309.57817US	8715
23911 7590 11/24/2009 CROWELL & MORING LLP INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY GROUP			EXAMINER	
			TRAN, BINH Q	
P.O. BOX 14300 WASHINGTON, DC 20044-4300			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3748	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/24/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/581,890	DUVINAGE ET AL.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		BINH Q. TRAN	3748			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
Status						
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>08 Ju</u>	ily 2009				
•		action is non-final.				
′=	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
٠,١	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
		parto Quayro, 1000 0.5. 11, 10	0.0.210.			
Dispositi	on of Claims					
4)🛛	☑ Claim(s) <u>9-25</u> is/are pending in the application.					
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)🖂	6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>9-25</u> is/are rejected.					
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.					
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.				
Applicati	on Papers					
9)□	The specification is objected to by the Examine	r.				
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119					
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 						
2) Notic 3) Inforr	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	te			

DETAILED ACTION

This office action is in response to the amendment filed July 08, 2009.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liang et al. (Liang) (Patent Number 6,363,771) in view of Ott et al. (Ott) (Patent Number 5,763,771).

Regarding claims 9, 16, and 19-20, Liang discloses an exhaust gas purification system and method for a motor vehicle having a predetermined maintenance interval, comprising: a reducing agent storage tank (e.g. 12) for storing a reducing agent intended for exhaust gas purification, wherein the reducing agent storage tank is configured to have a capacity (Volume of the Tank) that is at least equal to a level predetermined (Amount of the Urea in the Tank) by an assumed reducing agent consumption during the maintenance interval (in light of Applicant's Specification, Paragraph 0008); and wherein said closure device is configured to only be openable during a maintenance operation (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67). However, Liang fails to disclose means for preventing a restarting of the vehicle after the vehicle has been switched off if the reducing agent storage tank is emptied.

Ott teaches means for preventing a restarting of the vehicle after the vehicle has been switched off if the reducing agent storage tank is emptied (e.g. See col. 4, lines 39-67; col. 5, lines 1-36).

It would have been recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, that applying the known technique of using means for preventing a restarting of the vehicle after the vehicle has been switched off if the reducing agent storage tank is emptied of the vehicle as taught by Ott to the exhaust system of Liang, would have yielded predicable results and resulted in an improved system for preventing the damage to the catalytic converter in the exhaust gas system of the vehicle, so as to further improve the performance of the engine and the efficiency of the emission system. (See "KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex Inc., 82 USPQ2d 1385 (U.S. 2007)").

Regarding claims 10, Liang further discloses wherein the reducing agent storage tank has a closure apparatus (e.g. 14, 20, 40) which is openable for refilling purposes, the closure apparatus being configured to protect against being opened other than during a maintenance operation (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 11, Liang further discloses wherein the reducing agent storage tank has a closure apparatus which may be opened for refilling purposes, the closure apparatus being configured to protect against being opened other than by authorized persons (Obvious for all the closure apparatus) (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 12, Liang further discloses wherein the reducing agent storage tank has a closure apparatus which may be opened for refilling purposes, the closure apparatus being

configured to protect against being opened other than after the maintenance interval has elapsed (Obvious for all the closure apparatus) (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 13, Liang further discloses wherein said system is provided with components for level monitoring for the purpose of monitoring the quantity of reducing agent that is present in the reducing agent storage tank, so that a warning signal (e.g. 38, 42, 62) may be sent when the quantity of reducing agent drops below a determined residual quantity (e.g. See col. 4, lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 14, Liang further discloses wherein said residual quantity is determined based on an assumed consumption rate and the remaining running time until the end of the maintenance interval (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 15, Liang further discloses wherein said residual quantity is determined based on a measured consumption rate and the remaining running time until the end of the maintenance interval (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 17, Liang further discloses wherein the steps of unlocking a closure device for the reducing agent storage tank and refilling the reducing storage tank are conducted during a maintenance operation (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 18, Liang further discloses wherein the steps of unlocking (**Refill the Tank**) a closure device for the reducing agent storage tank and refilling the reducing storage tank are conducted after the end of the maintenance interval (e.g. See col. 3, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 21, Liang further discloses the steps of: determining a consumption rate for the reducing agent, determining a reducing agent consumption quantity which is to be expected by the end of the maintenance interval, and sending a warning signal if the expected

consumption quantity exceeds the quantity of reducing agent in the reducing agent storage tank (e.g. See col. 4, lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 22, Liang further discloses effecting intervention measures to reduce a consumption rate for the reducing agent after a predetermined motor vehicle running distance has been exceeded following a warning signal being sent (e.g. See col. 4, lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 23, Liang further discloses effecting intervention measures to reduce a consumption rate for the reducing agent after a predetermined motor vehicle running distance has been exceeded following a warning signal being sent (e.g. See col. 4, lines 48-67).

Regarding claim 24, Liang further discloses restricting the driving speed of the motor vehicle or the rotational speed of the motor vehicle drive engine is restricted after a predetermined motor vehicle running distance has been exceeded following a warning signal being sent (e.g. See col. 4, lines 1-67).

Regarding claim 25, Liang further discloses restricting the driving speed of the motor vehicle or the rotational speed of the motor vehicle drive engine is restricted after a predetermined motor vehicle running distance has been exceeded following a warning signal being sent (e.g. See col. 4, lines 1-67).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed July 08, 2009 have been fully considered but they are not completely persuasive. *Claims 9-25 are pending*.

Applicant's cooperation in explaining the claims subject matter more specific to overcome the claim rejection is appreciated.

Application/Control Number: 10/581,890

Art Unit: 3748

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 9-25 have been considered but are moot in

Page 6

view of the new ground(s) of rejection as discussed above.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Examiner Binh Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4865.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor,

Thomas E. Denion, can be reach on (571) 272-4859. The fax phone numbers for the organization

where this application or proceeding is assigned are (571) 273-8300 for regular communications

and for After Final communications.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/BINH Q. TRAN/

Binh Q. Tran

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3748

November 19, 2009